

Date: Thu, 1 Apr 93 13:48:34 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #406
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Thu, 1 Apr 93 Volume 93 : Issue 406

Today's Topics:

1rst Amendment rights & Ham Radio. (was: Another 3rd Party Question)
 Callsign processing time (2 msgs)
 Elmers List Large Type Edition (New!)
 Request: Modification instructions for Radio Shack HTX-202.
RFD: rec.radio.amateur reorganization [discussion summary 3/31]
 RFD [rec.radio.amateur reorg] (2 msgs)
 Seeking advices
 used 940 or new 737 or 990?
 Worked NF6???/KP1, was this Navassa Island?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 1 Apr 93 16:47:59 GMT
From: spool.mu.edu!mixcom.com!mei.mon@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: 1rst Amendment rights & Ham Radio. (was: Another 3rd Party Question)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In <1993Mar30.105444.19849@hemlock.cray.com> dadams@cray.com (David Adams) writes:

>Well, it seems to me that if the First Ammendment has anything to do with amateur
>radio, that it ought to protect the right to discuss political information. We
>don't have that right necessarily, so I'd guess the First Amendment must be kinda
>weak here?

Why do so many people assume that the U.S. Constitution defines the rights
the government gives to the people?? Does it not define the rights we (the

people) give to the government?? If not, should we not start thinking that way, before it's too late? And I'm not just talking amateur radio here.

Not a flame, Dave. Just a pet peeve of mine!

>---

>--David C. Adams Statistician Cray Research Inc. dadams@cray.com

>

>-----
> Old Sourdoughs never die. They just ferment away.

Kevin Jessup, N9SQB

Temporarily using our companies corporate account. Many other individuals use it as well. Please state in any E-mail follow-ups that the mail is intended for me so as to avoid confusion. Thanks.

Marquette Electronics, Inc. account information follows...

--

mei.mon@mixcom.com

Date: 1 Apr 93 10:02:52 EDT

From: saimiri.prima.te.wisc.edu!news.crd.ge.com!sunblossom!ge-dab!

cho006.cho.ge.com!wright_t@ames.arpa

Subject: Callsign processing time

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I've been grazing off of this newsgroup for the last couple of months looking for clues as to how long it takes to get your first set of call letters. Now I know. I took the technician test on Feb 13 and got the license out of the mailbox on March 31. Should I say just under 7 weeks ?

Tim Wright

KD4Z00

: -D

Date: 1 Apr 93 18:26:54 GMT

From: ogicse!uwm.edu!wupost!udel!gatech!prism!gt7479c@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Callsign processing time

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Apr1.100252.692@cho006.cho.ge.com> wright_t@cho006.cho.ge.com

writes:

>I've been grazing off of this newsgroup for the last couple of months
>looking for clues as to how long it takes to get your first set of call
>letters. Now I know. I took the technician test on Feb 13 and got the license
>out of the mailbox on March 31. Should I say just under 7 weeks ?
>
>Tim Wright
>KD4Z00
>KD4Z00

I took my test Feb. 1, and got my license on March 30. Sounds like
7-8 weeks is a good approximation.

Duncan Sinclair

KD4ZGH (It's hard to say, but at least it's a callsign).

Date: Thu, 1 Apr 1993 18:54:09 GMT

From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!

moe.ksu.ksu.edu!crcnis1.unl.edu!news.unomaha.edu!cwis!pschleck@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Elmers List Large Type Edition (New!)

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

To make my periodic information posting more useful to older amateurs
with weak eyesight, I will commence posting the Elmers list in 6X
enlargement ASCII. Because of its size, I will split the list into 31
equal parts (with automatic recalculation for shorter months) and post
them daily. The following is Part 1. Feedback about this new service
is most welcome, and may be addressed to the default Reply-To: of this
message.

73, Paul W. Schleck, KD3FU

pschleck@unomaha.edu

```
###      #      #      ###      #####      #####      #      #      #####
#      #      ##      ##      #      #      #      #      #      #
#      #      #      #      #      #      #      #      #####      #      #      #
#####      #      #      #####      #      #      #      #      #####
#      #      #      #      #      #      #      #      #      #      #
#      #      #      #      #      #      #      #####      #####      #      #
```

```
#####      ##      #####      #      #####
#      #      #      #      #      #      #      #      #
#      #      #      #      #      #      #      #      #
#####      #####      #      #      #      #
```


$\#$ $\#$ $\#$ $\#$ $\#$ $\#$ $\#$ $\#$ $\#$
 $\#$ $\#$ $\# \# \# \# \# \# \#$ $\#$ $\# \# \# \# \# \# \#$ $\# \# \# \# \# \# \#$ $\# \# \#$

ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff
ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff
ffffffffff	ffffffffff	ffffffffff	ffffffffff	ffffffffff	ffffffffff	ffffffffff	ffffffffff	ffffffffff
ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff
ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff

	♯			
	♯	♯♯♯♯♯♯♯	♯♯♯♯♯♯♯	♯♯♯♯♯♯♯
	♯	♯	♯	♯
	♯	♯♯♯♯♯♯	♯♯♯♯♯♯	♯♯♯♯♯♯
♯	♯	♯	♯	♯
♯	♯	♯	♯	♯
♯♯♯♯♯♯♯	♯♯♯♯♯♯♯♯	♯	♯	

ff									
ff	ff	ff	ff	ffffffffff	ff	ff	ffffffffff		
ff	ff	ffff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	
ff	ff	ff	ff	ff		ff	ff	ffffffffff	
ffffffffff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ffff	ff	ff		ff
ff	ff	ff	ffff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff
ff	ff	ff	ff	ffffffffff	ffffffffff	ffffffffff			

ff	ff	ff	ffffffffff	ffffffffffffff	ff	ff	ffff
ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff
ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff
ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ffffffffff	ffffffffffffff	ff
ff	ff	ff	ffffffffff	ff	ff	ff	ff
ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff	ff
ffff	ffff	ff	ff	ffffffffff	ff	ffff	ffff

[illegible]

fffff	f	f	f	f	f	ffffff	
f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
fffff	ffffff		f	f		f	f
	f	f	f	f		f	f

#####

#

#

#

#

(to be continued...)

Date: 1 Apr 93 17:05:00 GMT
From: noc.near.net!saturn.caps.maine.edu!maine.maine.edu!umasp@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Request: Modification instructions for Radio Shack HTX-202.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I am making this post for my nephew who doesn't have access to Netnews.
He currently has a Radio Shack HTX-202, 2-meter radio and was looking to
make modifications. If anyone has any instructions for modifying the
frequency or other modification information regarding the HTX-202 it would
be greatly appreciated. Information can be sent directly to me and I will

forward to him. He has mail capability, but not much else.

Thank you,

George Newell
umasp@maine.maine.edu
umasp@maine.bitnet

Date: 1 Apr 93 08:12:09 GMT
From: pacbell.com!amdahl!amdahl!ikluft@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: RFD: rec.radio.amateur reorganization [discussion summary 3/31]
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Scanning through the discussion that has been posted on news.groups so far, there appears to be support for a reorganization of rec.radio.amateur. I've taken a tally, though I want to caution everyone that THESE ARE NOT VOTES because voting won't occur unless the discussion phase shows enough support to allow us to proceed to a vote.

Tally so far: 13 in favor, 7 opposed, 8 unclear or undecided
Several of the "in favor" messages included modifications to the RFD which may or may not be conditional. So this number represents 13 in favor of a split but not necessarily for the exact proposal in the RFD.

WHAT WE NEED TO DO NOW IS BRING TOGETHER THE SUGGESTIONS WE HAVE INTO A NEW PROPOSAL WHICH CAN BECOME THE "CALL FOR VOTES". IF YOU SUPPORT A SPLIT OF REC.RADIO.AMATEUR, YOU NEED TO REMEMBER THIS IS A DEMOCRATIC PROCESS - LET'S TRY TO MAKE A PROPOSAL THAT CAN PASS A VOTE ON THE NEWSGROUP AND WORK IN PRACTICE. That will mean that probably no one will get exactly what they want. We need to be patient with the fact that other people have input too.

Of the suggestions made for changes, I would like to handle these the same as we did on the rra-reorg mail list. A suggestion needs to appear more than once (by different people) and outnumber the opposing opinions in order to make it in.

Suggestions which more than one person suggested were as follows (opposition is unknown so these are still open for discussion):

- * r.r.a.products should be renamed r.r.a.equipment
 - this was a common theme among a few otherwise-dissimilar variations
 - * r.r.a.space should be created whether the r.r.a.tech option is chosen or not
- If there is no opposition, these will become part of the evolving proposal.

Other notes:

- * A common concern was that the mail lists will need to match the newsgroups in order for this to work.

- * The question of which is supported more between the main set of newsgroups and the r.r.a.tech option is just as unclear as it was in the rra-reorg mail list. More discussion is needed - we definitely need to resolve this.
- * a couple responses questioned the r.r.a.digital subhierarchy or whether the groups would be big enough to support a newsgroup of their own. Since this part of the proposal was brought up by r.r.a.packet users and unopposed by others from that group, more comments are needed, especially from r.r.a.packet.

Let the discussion continue... I'll try to put together a picture of what looks like it can pass a vote as people say what they can support.

For reference - recap of RFD proposals

Summary of RFD proposed newsgroups (Option I)

(all groups unmoderated)

Newsgroup name	description
rec.radio.amateur.misc	all Ham radio topics not covered below i.e. video, stories, humor, new topics [no modification to existing newsgroup]
rec.radio.amateur.policy	regulations & policy issues [no modification to existing newsgroup]
rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc	packet radio & other digital modes [includes old rec.radio.amateur.packet]
rec.radio.amateur.digital.tcp-ip	TCP/IP via packet radio
rec.radio.amateur.operating	Operating procedures and questions: DX, CW, contests, propagation, repeaters
rec.radio.amateur.products	manufactured equipment, modifications
rec.radio.amateur.instruction	Ham radio instruction & examination
rec.radio.amateur.construction	homebrewing & experimentation
rec.radio.amateur.space	amateur radio in space: satellites, earth-moon-earth (EME), shuttle, MIR
rec.radio.amateur.emerg-services	emergency services: RACES, ARES, NTS

Summary of RFD proposed newsgroups (Option II - "the .tech option")

(all groups unmoderated)

Newsgroup name	description
rec.radio.amateur.misc	all Ham radio topics not covered below i.e. video, stories, humor, new topics [no modification to existing newsgroup]
rec.radio.amateur.policy	regulations & policy issues

rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc	[no modification to existing newsgroup]
	packet radio & other digital modes
rec.radio.amateur.digital.tcp-ip	[includes old rec.radio.amateur.packet]
	TCP/IP via packet radio
rec.radio.amateur.operating	Operating procedures and questions: DX,
	CW, contests, propagation, repeaters
rec.radio.amateur.emerg-services	emergency services: RACES, ARES, NTS
rec.radio.amateur.tech	Technical discussions about Ham Radio:
	construction, satellites, theory,
	examinations, video

Ian Klufft KD6EUI PP-ASEL Amdahl Corporation, Open Systems Development
 iklufft@uts.amdahl.com Santa Clara, CA
 [disclaimer: any opinions expressed are mine only - not those of my employer]

--

Ian Klufft KD6EUI PP-ASEL Amdahl Corporation, Open Systems Development
 iklufft@uts.amdahl.com Santa Clara, CA
 [disclaimer: any opinions expressed are mine only... not those of my employer]

Date: Thu, 1 Apr 1993 19:28:26 GMT
 From: news.service.uci.edu!ttinews!calvin.tti.com!cole@network.UCSD.EDU
 Subject: RFD [rec.radio.amateur reorg]
 To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Please record that I'm adamantly opposed to the proposed reorganization. It strikes me as nit-picky. The mind boggles at the number of possible crossposts which would result. If we want a general discussion group with a large, varied audience we're just going to have to live with some jerks, flamers, and un-ending topics. It's a small price to pay.

Randy Cole
 KN6W

Date: 31 Mar 93 21:42:36 GMT
 From: pacbell.com!amdahl!amdahl!iklufft@network.UCSD.EDU
 Subject: RFD [rec.radio.amateur reorg]
 To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

skitch@nadc.navy.mil (M. Squicciarini) writes:
 > This may sound flippant but why not change
 > rec.radio.amateur.misc
 > to
 > rec.radio.amateur.flame

Bill

Date: 1 Apr 1993 15:28:40 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!wupost!zaphod.mps.ohio-
state.edu!malgudi.oar.net!news.ysu.edu!yfn.ysu.edu!ag821@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: used 940 or new 737 or 990?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Help, Please!!!

I just sold my rig and want to upgrade. I do mostly CW, also
RTTY and AMTOR and soon PACTOR, Contesting, DXing (a little).

I want a rig that I won't be looking to replace for a while,
with a real good auto-tuner, and ability to be controlled
by most software (CT, Logging, TNC)

I have a 940sat that is supposedly in excellent condition
with CW filter and external speaker (with filters) and MC60
mike that I can get at a real good price. For a little more I
can get a brand new Icom 737.. but heard that there was a
DXpedition that was real unhappy with their Icom
equipment. I liked the looks of the 990 .. but don't know whether
they have solved the computer control problem. Guess I would
also consider a brand new 850sat (I have a power supply).

We don't have any stores that I can go to to actually see
any of these rigs.. need to rely on opinions.

thans

(will need to decide by tonite about the used 940)

73s

Jeff, AC4HF

--

Jeff M. Gold, AC4HF
Manager, Academic Computing Support
Tennessee Technological University

Date: 1 Apr 93 20:10:23 GMT
From: news.service.uci.edu!ucivax!gateway@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Worked NF6??*/KP1, was this Navassa Island?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Apr1.153346.3246@cbnewsm.cb.att.com> you write:

>Last night I worked NF6***/KP1 at 0238 UTC. I was hoping that someone
>could fill in the rest. Namely, the rest of his call and if this was
>Navassa Island. He was sending just above the range where I can copy
>CW well. Something about the way he sent I just couldn't copy his call
>exactly. Might have been a KP0 but I hope not! 8-) Thanks for any and
>all help here! 73!

>Jeff

It was NF6S, it was KP1 Navassa, QSL via W5IJU.

73, Greg, KD4HZ

Greg, KD4HZ // g-taylor4@tamu.edu // 409-845-4445

Date: 1 Apr 93 20:21:03 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!lll-winken.llnl.gov!nirvana.llnl.gov!user@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Mar30.171217.11783@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,
<1pa07a\$avc@network.ucsd.edu>, <1993Mar31.064154.29965@usl.edu>
Subject : Re: Wanted: thoughts on glass mount ants

In article <1993Mar31.064154.29965@usl.edu>, cfm1471@ucs.usl.edu (Morrison
Charles F) wrote:

> It must be a California thing that you have such little value for something
> that you would (should) work hard for, but with people blowing away each
> other with 12 gauge shotguns on the California freeways, hey, whats another
> hole??

Wrong, here in California we use 9 mm's and 357's, too hard to steer and
fire rounds from the shotgun, and carry on a QSO at the same time :)

Dave Parker
davep@llnl.gov
KD6RRS

Date: 1 Apr 93 19:27:59 GMT
From: csus.edu!netcom.com!jfh@decwrl.dec.com
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <N4HY.93Mar30102143@tang.ccr-p.ida.org>, <jfhC4qEw5.DD4@netcom.com>,
<1993Apr1.143555.22479@nrtpa038.bnr.ca>
Subject : Re: motive ...

kme@node_17aa4.bnr.ca (Ken Michael Edwards) wrote:

>This whole discussion would be better served in the rec.radio.amateur.policy
>newsgroup (if you start pointing out where things belong). The original posting
>had to do more with politcis than amateur radio, maybe you should consider
>alt.politics.correct ???

No, it had to do with the ARRL. I thought the policy group was for amateur
radio policy at the federal/international level, not ARRL policy.

--

Jack Hamilton jfh@netcom.com P. O. Box 281107 SF, CA 94128-1107

Date: 1 Apr 93 16:56:45 GMT
From: olivea!sgigate!sgiblab!spies!wicat!keithm@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <C4MsHH.Mz7@odin.corp.sgi.com>, <1993Mar31.144451.2694@mixcom.com>,
<1993Mar31.172036.17154@VFL.Paramax.COM>
Subject : Re: "CB transplants"

>Okay, here's a little quiz. How many of you *never* used a CB before
>becoming a ham?

>

>The rest of you, hang your heads in shame; you're "CB transplants."

Forgive me for asking, but why should I hang my head in shame? Yes,
I used a CB radio before I got a ham license. No, I did not do it
illegally. I applied for and received an FCC license, and I identified
using it. I used type accepted radios, legal power limits, and spoke
in a civilized fashion. I was a member of the local REACT team and

participated in emergency and public service communications much as I do now using amateur radio.

There is nothing wrong with this.

I admit that there was a very obnoxious minority that ruined the band for anyone wanting to use it for a legitimate purpose, but don't assume that everyone with a CB acts or acted that way. If you were to compare some of the language and activities on 20m (for example) to CB (as it is now :() you would find little difference. These are the people who should "hang their heads in shame".

--

Keith McQueen, Wicat Systems Inc. , (801)224-6400	My opinions are
Packet: n7hmf @ nv7v.UT.USA.NA	all mine...
Internet: keithm@wicat.com	...so there!

Date: Thu, 1 Apr 1993 14:35:55 GMT
From: vela.acs.oakland.edu!cs.uiuc.edu!wupost!udel!gatech!usenet.ufl.edu!
usenet.cis.ufl.edu!caen!uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!convex!news.utdallas.edu!corpgate!
brtph560!nrtpa038!@newshub.nosc.mil
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Mar30.055939.18122@bongo.tele.com>, <N4HY.93Mar30102143@tang.ccr-p.ida.org>, <jfhC4qEw5.DD4@netcom.com>s
Subject : Re: motive ...

In article <jfhC4qEw5.DD4@netcom.com>, jfh@netcom.com (Jack Hamilton) writes:
|> n4hy@tang.ccr-p.ida.org (Bob McGwier) wrote:
|>
|> >I could not agree more. I bitterly resent the damage done to Boy Scouts
|> >by the removal of funding from various sources.
|>
|> There's been lots of discussion of this in rec.scouting. That's where it
|> belongs - not here.
|>
|> --
|>
|> -----
|> Jack Hamilton jfh@netcom.com P. O. Box 281107 SF, CA 94128-1107

This whole discussion would be better served in the rec.radio.amateur.policy newsgroup (if you start pointing out where things belong). The original posting had to do more with politcis than amateur radio, maybe you should consider alt.politics.correct ???

--

=====

Ken M. Edwards, Bell Northern Research, Research Triangle Park, NC
(919) 481-8476 email: cnc23a@bnr.ca Ham: N4ZBB

All opinions are my own and do not necessarily reflect the views of
my employer or co-workers, family, friends, congress, or president.

"You'd better call my dad...My mom's pretty busy."
- Chelsea Clinton

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #406
